

April 22

policy is entitled to feel well rewarded for standing up against the divisive forces of this country which did so much in the last 12 months to try to confuse and obstruct the policy of attaining peace and nationalism in the new nations of Africa.

I am happy to say that whatever efforts there have been from certain racist groups in this country to keep the people of Africa from obtaining control of their own countries, and getting their independence and freedom, appear to have been defeated.

No one can say how long this success can continue, and I would be the last to predict that our policy in Africa will not suffer setbacks in the future, as they have in the past; but I am confident we are on the right track. When we stand up for freedom and independence without regard to race, color, or creed, we are standing for the finest traditions of our country, and we have achieved great success in following that policy in what was once called the Dark Continent.

U.S. POLICY TOWARD CUBA

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I have noted during the weekend and the last few days a new spate of criticism with respect to the administration's Cuban policy. Articles have appeared with the suggestions that the authors have had access to confidential intelligence information indicating there has been a large buildup of Russian forces in Cuba.

It is suggested that the number of troops there has increased substantially, rather than been reduced. It is even suggested that the President of the United States has been fooled in the intelligence information which he is receiving. It is suggested that a certain U.S. Senator on the other side of the aisle knows more about the intelligence situation in Cuba than does the President of the United States, the Chief of our CIA, the intelligence agencies of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, and others.

This may well turn out to be correct in the long run, Mr. President. I have no secret information with respect to intelligence in Cuba. I do have a feeling that the President of the United States and Mr. McCone, head of the CIA, who, I am sure, is advising the President on the basis of the most accurate and up-to-date intelligence information which is available to our country, are receiving a great deal better information than one could get from reading Hanson Baldwin in the New York Times and listening to certain Members of this body who would have us believe that they know more about what is going on in Cuba than do the President and his advisers.

It so happens that there appeared in this morning's Philadelphia Inquirer a lead editorial entitled "Charting a Course on Cuba."

I ask unanimous consent that the editorial may appear in the Record at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

CHARTING A COURSE ON CUBA

America's agonizing debate over the problem of Cuba, and what to do about it, is in danger of getting bogged down in generalities at a time when the emphasis should be on specific courses of action.

Discussion of hypothetical conditions under which U.S. Armed Forces might invade Cuba does not get to the nub of the matter.

As we see it, U.S. policy on Cuba should have these four fundamental components:

1. The foremost objective should be the establishment of national independence, individual freedom and democratic government for the Cuban people.

2. The primary emphasis should be on attaining this objective by peaceful means rather than by war. (War is not a legitimate arm of diplomacy; it is the result of the failure of diplomacy.)

3. The first priority of immediate goals should be to obtain the removal of Soviet troops from Cuba and whatever weapons of aggression may still be there.

4. The sole authority over U.S. foreign policy must be held at all times by responsible officials of the U.S. Government, not by Cuban exiles who have been given sanctuary in this country. Aid and advice of the exiles should be enlisted when appropriate but a great nation cannot allow any foreign group, no matter how sympathetic we are to their aspirations, to call the shots in a situation where the issue of peace or war may hang in precarious balance.

To supplement this kind of policy on Cuba it will be necessary to learn definitively and at an early date whether or not Premier Khrushchev intends to get those Russian troops out of Cuba. This query must be put to Moscow in a reasonable but blunt manner. If Mr. Khrushchev chooses to consider such a question an ultimatum, then so be it.

An affirmative response is not so unlikely as some of the pessimists think. The Soviets, for all their ruthlessness, are practical men. They know that America, not Russia, holds the high cards in the Cuban controversy.

If the Russians insist on continuing their moves to make Cuba a Soviet military state there are a number of steps open to the United States and other members of the Organization of American States, and perhaps the North Atlantic Treaty Organization, that need not provoke war. Collective economic sanctions—including, possibly, some kind of quarantine or blockade—could be applied as circumstances warrant.

Bang-bang boys who want to solve the problem by opening fire on Cuba ought to bear in mind that the aim is to save the country, not annihilate it. Last resorts should not be applied until first resorts have been fairly tried.

The weakness in American policy on Cuba is not, as some critics contend, a reluctance to use armed force. That is a strength. The great need is for more vigorous application of economic and diplomatic weapons.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, that editorial, from my point of view, states accurately and ably what our policy in Cuba should be. The policy advocated by this fine Philadelphia newspaper is the exact policy of the President of the United States.

It calls for, first, as the foremost objective, the establishment of national independence, individual freedom, and democratic government for the people of Cuba.

That is our national objective, the first and primary one. That is the policy of the President of the United States.

The second point is stated as being the

attaining of that objective by peaceful means rather than by war. The Inquirer points out that war is not a legitimate arm of diplomacy; it is the result of the failure of diplomacy.

I am glad to say that despite the many war-whoopers, as Mr. Lippmann calls them, some of them among our own Members of this body, the President of the United States is committed to the objective of attaining that goal through diplomacy, legitimate sanctions short of war, conferences with our allies in the Organization of American States, and, through diplomatic efforts on the part of Latin American countries as well as our own, toward attaining the first and foremost objective, which is the establishment of national independence, individual freedom, and democratic government for the people of Cuba.

The third point made by the editorial is that the first priority of immediate goals should be to obtain the removal of Soviet troops from Cuba and whatever weapons of aggression may still be there.

That surely is true. That is certainly one of the most important objectives of this administration. The point is we mean to do it by diplomatic means, we mean to do it by keeping our treaty obligations, not by violating them, we mean to do it by supporting the United Nations, we mean to do it by supporting the Organization of American States. We do not mean to do it in an immature, childish way, by taking an attitude of "March up San Juan Hill"; by sending American boys to die in Cuba; by starting a war which, almost without question, would spread across the world; or imposing that kind of blockade which would, in itself, be a violation of international law, and therefore an act of war.

The fourth point made in the editorial is that the sole authority over U.S. foreign policy must be held at all times by responsible officials of the U.S. Government, and not by Cuban exiles.

We want to support the Cuban exiles in their legitimate desires to return to Cuba. We hope in due course they will be able to return and take their legitimate place in the economy and in the Government of that country, which we can hope will be under democratic auspices. We hope that they may be able to return to their native country and help their country take its rightful place among the democratic nations and people who believe in freedom.

But the way to do it is to make perfectly clear that we, too, believe in freedom, that we, too, believe in international law, that we, too, believe in keeping our treaty commitments. Here is the sentence from the editorial which I commend to the consideration of my colleagues in the Senate:

Bang-bang boys who want to "solve" the problem by opening fire on Cuba ought to bear in mind that the aim is to save the country, not annihilate it.

I support that position wholeheartedly. I am happy to note that it is the policy of the President of the United States. I call attention to the fact that the Phila-

1963

those who felt we should not have supported the United Nations; criticism by those who supported Mr. Tshombe and his white mercenaries in Katanga—peace and parliamentary government are making substantial progress there.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that an article which appeared in this morning's New York Times, entitled "Congo's Regime Wins First Test," under the byline of J. Anthony Lukas, written in Leopoldville, may be printed in the RECORD at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CONGO'S REGIME WINS FIRST TEST—ADOUA'S NEW GOVERNMENT BEATS NO-CONFIDENCE MOVE

(By J. Anthony Lukas)

LEOPOLDVILLE, THE CONGO, APRIL 21.—Premier Cyrille Adoula's new "Government of National Reconciliation" has defeated the first challenge by the die-hard opposition in Parliament.

After a noisy 7-hour debate that ended late last night, government supporters in the senate defeated a nonconfidence motion against the cabinet. The vote was 31 to 20 with 4 abstentions.

The margin indicates that Mr. Adoula's new coalition, formed only 5 days ago, has at least a temporary majority in Parliament.

The new government contains a wide sampling from the opposition, which has been harrying the Premier for months. Only the extremists remain in opposition.

SIGNIFICANT VICTORY

Observers believed last night's victory was particularly significant because the no-confidence motion was based on an issue that had aroused concern cutting across party lines. This was that Mr. Adoula planned to send the legislators home for an extended vacation June 30 and rule by decree.

Opposition speakers charged during the debate that the Premier recently told associates he would take this step, relying on powers in the controversial article 67 of the country's fundamental law.

This article provides that the present legislature must sit at least 3 years, but not more than 4 years. The 3 years would be up June 30.

Opposition speakers charged last night that Mr. Adoula would close the legislature on that day and rule by decree until new elections could be held. That would probably be several years away.

As evidence of Mr. Adoula's intentions, the motion cited statements he was alleged to have made to his associates, his past handling of the Parliament and a message sent from New York to the Adoula government here.

Etienne Kikaka, chief spokesman for the opposition, declared that this message contained instructions for Mr. Adoula from quarters in the United States on how to deal with Parliament.

"This is an authentic document," he shouted, waving a piece of paper.

It was later identified as a French translation of an article that had appeared in the New York Times. The message apparently was sent to the Ministry of Foreign Affairs here by the Congolese Mission at the United Nations.

The article, written by the Times' correspondent in Leopoldville, was an analysis of the political situation here on the eve of last week's cabinet reshuffle. It appeared in the Times of April 7.

The motion of no confidence quoted only part of one paragraph from the French trans-

lation in support of the charge against Mr. Adoula. The quotation, in the original English, is as follows:

"A cabinet reshuffle may ease the situation, but skeptics have their doubts. There are increasing suggestions that the way to handle Parliament is to send it on a nice long vacation again, maybe 2 years instead of 2 months this time. There is even talk of a military coup d'etat."

In the original article that paragraph ended with the words "If the opposition should get out of hand again."

In his response last night Mr. Adoula did not deny he was considering using article 67 as a means of ending this legislature's term on June 30.

He denied, however, that this would amount to a dissolution of Parliament, as the opposition alleged. The Premier said Parliament could be dissolved only by the head of state, President Joseph Kasavubu, with the concurrence of two-thirds of at least one chamber.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, the article points out that Premier Cyrille Adoula's new "Government of National Reconciliation" has defeated the first challenge by its diehard opposition in the Parliament. It should be pointed out that, in an effort to pacify the various political factions in the country, Premier Adoula had brought into his government all save the most irreconcilable factions in the Congo. The question was raised as to a vote of confidence for his government, and the Premier won by a vote of 31 to 20.

This new government contains a wide sampling from the various factions of the opposition which had been harrying the Premier for months. I believe it is an indication of the sound statesmanship of Mr. Adoula, who is strongly supported by the United Nations and the United States, that he has been able to win this parliamentary fight.

It is interesting to note that those who are attempting to create more havoc in the Congo, including, of course, the Soviet Union, which has found some rather strange allies in this country in that regard have been misquoting newspaper articles which have appeared in this country—indeed, in the New York Times. The New York Times account referred to in the article which I have placed in the RECORD was quoted out of context, and if read as a whole is clearly a sound report of political conditions in the Congo, and not critical of Mr. Adoula's government.

I am happy to note again for the RECORD that the U.S. policy in the Congo has been extremely successful.

In this connection, I ask unanimous consent that an interesting column by Mr. Roscoe Drummond, which appeared in the Philadelphia Inquirer this morning, may also be printed in the RECORD at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

COLUMN BY ROSCOE DRUMMOND

WASHINGTON.—Whenever the Soviet Union loses the diplomatic initiative, it turns to propaganda to cover up. Moscow is up against it in Africa. Things are going badly, with their reach for power blocked or blunted by the African nations themselves.

So Pravda is called to the front lines. It aims a barrage at those awful "Western imperialists," whom it accuses of being intent upon fastening colonial rule on the whole African continent.

This bizarre blast comes in the wake of one of the most remarkable achievements in behalf of political freedom in all human history: In only 3 years—from 1960 to 1963—the once colonialist Western nations have furthered the independence of 23 African countries and welcomed them into the United Nations.

At the same time the Soviet Union grips tenaciously the nations of Eastern Europe which it took by force after the Second World War and which it had to hold by force when the people of East Germany, Hungary and Poland successively sought to free themselves from Soviet rule.

It reached out to expand its imperialist power to Cuba and has made such menacing gestures toward the Middle East and Africa that local communism has lost much of its lure.

The fact that the Kremlin has been so unsuccessful in extending its sway into the Middle East and into Africa undoubtedly explains, in part, the full-page editorial in Pravda appealing to the Africans to be wary of any and all association with the West. This is what's been happening:

Ghana and Guinea have shown themselves exceedingly disappointed in their relations with the Soviets and are encouraging investment of Western capital to reinforce their economies.

The new African states are showing little interest in embracing the proclaimed Communist answer to their economic ills. The broad tendency is toward a mixed economy with some public ownership and a substantial borrowing from the ways of Western society.

Former French colonies which have now won their independence have their eyes far more on the burgeoning European Economic Community than on Russia.

Arab Nations in North Africa have been giving the Reds the back of their wrist. Arab-Soviet ties have been steadily deteriorating, as evidenced by the suppression of Communist parties in Iraq, Syria, Algeria, Morocco, Tunisia and the United Arab Republic.

The Kremlin is not, of course, giving up. It never does. It is staking much of its hopes for expanding its influence on the indoctrination of several thousands of African students who have been attending Soviet universities and colleges.

But the indoctrination isn't going very well. There are signs that the African students are becoming disenchanted. A group of them recently bolted Bulgaria, complaining of racial discrimination and police brutality.

Mr. CLARK. This article points out, in Mr. Drummond's usual, clear style, how very successful U.S. policy has been, under the Kennedy administration, throughout Africa; how 23 new African countries have obtained their independence between 1960 and 1963; have been welcomed peacefully into the United Nations; how much of this is due to the efforts of both the Kennedy administration, and the Eisenhower administration.

This article points out that this has been a great diplomatic triumph over the Kremlin and Russia, because of the support we have given the African policy of the United Nations.

I think everyone in our country who supported either President Eisenhower or President Kennedy in their African

1963

delphia Inquirer, its publisher and editor, my good friend, Walter Annenberg, has always supported the Republican Party in national elections. That makes this editorial even more significant than before.

In this connection we should give careful attention to the very intelligent answer made by the President of the United States in the question and answer period which took place after his address to the American Society of Newspaper Editors in Washington last Saturday.

I ask unanimous consent that the question asked at the conclusion of his speech and the answer that he made thereto may be printed in full in the RECORD at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the excerpt was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

RIFT WITH CUBAN EXILES

Q. Mr. President, would you give us your views or whatever you have to say about Miró Cardona and his charges that you backed out on a promise for a second invasion and the other things in his statement?

A. Why, I think the Department of State has already made a comment which represents the views of the Government. Dr. Cardona lives in Miami which is the center, of course, of the exiles, the center of their hopes, and I think that a good many Cubans feel that the only way that they can return to Cuba is by a military action of the United States.

We're conscious of our obligations to our own people, our own security, our alliances, our responsibilities, as I said, as the chief defender of freedom all over the world. We have not determined that it's in our national interest or in the general interests of the hemisphere for us to launch an invasion. And naturally, that disappoints the exiles. But, as the State Department statement said, the foreign policy of the United States, when so much depends upon us, must be made by the United States. And however much we may sympathize with their desire to be free, the United States cannot launch itself into a massive invasion of Cuba without considering the worldwide implications to other free countries and also its effect upon our own position.

Now, as to his charges, I don't think it's necessary to go through them. Quite obviously nobody in the U.S. Government ever informed anyone in the Government or outside the Government, Dr. Cardona or anyone else, that we were going to launch, or committed ourselves to launch, a military invasion of six divisions.

We appreciate very much the fact that a good many Cubans have volunteered for the American Armed Forces. I think that they can be very valuable there. No one knows what the future is going to bring. But I hope that Dr. Cardona and others will realize that this is not a struggle between the United States and the exiles. It's really a struggle against the Communist infiltration in this hemisphere. And while we may disagree as to what actions we should take to remove it, and while my obligations are somewhat different from Dr. Cardona's, I would hope that it would be possible for us to work together in the general interest, and that is the object of this Government.

We want to work with Dr. Cardona and all the other Cubans, but we must maintain the control of our policy here in the United States and here in Washington, and will continue to do so.

RELATIONS WITH CASTRO

Q. I'd like to read two others here also on the question of Cuba. If Castro remains in power for another 5 years, will the United States continue in its refusal to deal with his government? And the second one is, 2 years ago tomorrow, Mr. President, you stood here and told us Fidel Castro's days were numbered. You said, "Our restraint is not inexhaustible." You said we must not let, "the inter-American doctrine of non-interference conceal or excuse a policy of nonaction." Now, sir, Communist domination of Cuba is, if anything, more complete than 2 years ago and is stiffened by Russia. Many Americans believe our policy toward Cuba is indeed one of nonaction. What can you say to persuade them that this is not so? When, if ever, is our restraint going to come to an end?

A. Well, I hope our restraint or sense of responsibility will not ever come to an end. Now in the general question, since the last 2 years the United States has taken a good many actions in—to contain the spread of communism in the hemisphere. We—a good many nations in the Alliance for Progress, the Punta del Este declaration, the San Jose declaration—a number of nations have broken off diplomatic relations. Only five continue them with Cuba.

The free world trade—has dropped from 800 million to 80 million. The—efforts are being made since the San Jose conference to work with other countries to control the movement of personnel in and out of Cuba. It's quite obvious now to the hemisphere and, in fact, to the world, that Castro is merely a Soviet satellite. Every survey, every study, every meeting shows a sharp deterioration in the image that he once had as a great nationalist leader. And now he's generally regarded in the hemisphere as having sold out to the Communist movement and having now become a spearhead for the Soviet advance.

CONSTANT SURVEILLANCE

In addition, the United States maintains a constant surveillance. We've indicated that we would not permit any troops from Cuba to move off the island of Cuba in any offensive action against any neighboring country. We've indicated, also, that we would not accept a Hungary in Cuba—the use of Soviet troops against Cubans if there was any internal reaction against Castro. In many ways, we have attempted to isolate Cuba and to indicate our determination to continue that policy until Cuba is free.

Now after we've done all those steps, there are two alternatives—there are two additional policies which could be carried out.

I think that when those talk about—talk about Cuba, we ought to say what we want to do. We shouldn't say, Well, let's do something, or How long is our restraint going to last? I would think the two remaining policies are, one, a blockade, which of course brings us once again to a confrontation with the Soviet Union, and the other is invasion of Cuba.

In my judgment, it would be a mistake to carry out either one of those policies today. I don't know what conditions are going to bring in the future. No one predicted with certainty what was going to happen last fall. I don't know what's going to happen any place in the world. But—therefore, I think that we should maintain our strength and our determination, but I don't think that the conditions would serve the interest of the United States or of our allies to carry out either an invasion or blockade under these present conditions.

The United States is responsible for the independence of dozens of countries stretch-

ing from South Korea to Berlin. It is responsible for the defense, really, of Western Europe. It is responsible for the major struggle against the Communists in our own hemisphere. For 6 percent of the world's population we carry tremendous burdens. I do not think we can indulge ourselves at this point, if that is the proper word, in concentrating all of our material strength in one section of the world and be indifferent to its consequences elsewhere.

Now I don't know—I don't accept the views Mr. Castro is going to be in power for 5 years. I can't indicate the role by which there will be a change. But I've seen enough—as we all have—enough change in the last 15 years to make me feel that time is on the—that time will see Cuba free again, and I think when that happens the record will show that the United States has played a significant role.

But for the present, and for a great power which carries worldwide responsibility, I think our present policy is the right one. If the American people decide differently, then, of course, they have an obvious remedy. But for now we intend to follow this policy.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, the answer, in short, given in colloquial terms, but with the clarity for which our President is famous, indicates his strong support of the present policy in Cuba. I call particular attention to the fact that he says in his statement, after reviewing the strong steps we have taken to discourage Mr. Castro:

After we've done all those steps . . . there are two additional policies which could be carried out.

Then he points out that one is a blockade, which, of course, once again brings us into confrontation all over the world with the Soviet Union, and the other is an invasion of Cuba.

The President turns his back on both of these courses. He takes what I believe, I say again, to be a mature and sensible and common sense approach to the very difficult problem confronting us 90 miles from our shore. I commend him for his maturity. I commend him for the soundness of his policy.

TEXAN STRESSES NEED FOR S. 1200 WHICH WOULD GIVE VALIDITY TO THE WORDS "FHA INSURED"

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President, on March 28 I introduced a bill designed to give validity to the term "FHA insured" as a protection for home buyers. Twelve Members of the Senate have joined as cosponsors.

The national response to this legislation is heartening, and I will from time to time bring to the attention of my colleagues comments which are particularly pertinent.

Therefore, I ask unanimous consent that the text of a letter I have received from Texarkana, Tex., be printed in the RECORD at the close of my remarks.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TEXARKANA, TEX., April 1, 1963.

Senator ERNEST GRUENING,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: It is my understanding that you plan to submit a bill that will require the

April 22, 1963

Federal Housing Administration to correct major defects that appear after construction of an FHA house.

We need such legislation badly in this country, as the public is being cheated right and left on FHA housing.

FHA has had the responsibility, by implication if not by law, to protect the public in the past but has not lived up to this responsibility.

How many times have you seen the advertisement "Built Under FHA Inspection," or "Conforming to FHA Specifications"?

The average citizen, who is not expert in construction, believes that FHA sees that their insured loans houses are properly built and this certainly is not the case.

I know of several persons who contacted FHA about defective construction and were told that this was a matter between builder and buyer, in spite of the fact that they had made several inspections while the house was being built.

Another example of FHA's laxity is in the evaluation of houses. Old John Q. Citizen doesn't know the value of a house and is generally content to pay what FHA says a place is worth. I will bet you that more often than not, the FHA evaluation is higher than the actual market value of the house.

I am sure that all FHA people are honest, but if they are not, this would be a real fine opportunity for an unscrupulous builder and FHA employee to rook the public. Maybe they do, who knows?

I surely hope you get some help from Congress on this.

Very truly yours,

AUTHORITY FOR THE VICE PRESIDENT TO SIGN THE ENROLLED BILL H.R. 4715

Mr. HARTKE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that notwithstanding

ing the adjournment of the Senate today the Secretary be authorized to receive messages from the House and that the Vice President be authorized to sign the enrolled bill (H.R. 4715) to incorporate the Eleanor Roosevelt Memorial Foundation, duly passed by the two Houses and found truly enrolled.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. HARTKE. Mr. President, I move that the Senate adjourn until tomorrow at 12 o'clock noon.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 3 o'clock and 46 minutes p. m.) the Senate adjourned until tomorrow, Tuesday, April 23, 1963, at 12 o'clock meridian.

LEGISLATIVE COUNSEL

APR 24 9 50 AM '63

Approved For Release 2004/06/23 : CIA-RDP65B00383R000200250010-4

	UNCLASSIFIED		CONFIDENTIAL		SECRET
<p align="center">CENTRAL INTELLIGENCE AGENCY OFFICIAL ROUTING SLIP</p>					
TO	NAME AND ADDRESS		DATE	INITIALS	
1	DDCI 7D6011				
2	DCI 7D5607				
3					
4					
5					
6					
	ACTION		DIRECT REPLY		PREPARE REPLY
	APPROVAL		DISPATCH		RECOMMENDATION
	COMMENT		FILE		RETURN
	CONCURRENCE		INFORMATION		SIGNATURE
<p>Remarks: Attached is an excerpt from the Congressional Record of 22 April containing remarks by Senator Clark on the subject of Russian forces in Cuba and containing specific references to the Director, the Agency and intelligence information.</p> <p align="center">John S. Warner Legislative Counsel</p>					
FOLD HERE TO RETURN TO SENDER					
FROM: NAME, ADDRESS AND PHONE NO.					DATE
Legislative Counsel, 7D01					23 Apr 63
	UNCLASSIFIED		CONFIDENTIAL		SECRET

Approved For Release 2004/06/23 : CIA-RDP65B00383R000200250010-4

UNCLASSIFIED		CONFIDENTIAL		SECRET	
CENTRAL INTELLIGENCE AGENCY OFFICIAL ROUTING SLIP					
TO	NAME AND ADDRESS		DATE	INITIALS	
1	DDCI 7D6011 4/23		4/23/63	[Signature]	
2	DCI 7D5607			[Signature]	
3					
4					
5					
6					
ACTION		DIRECT REPLY		PREPARE REPLY	
APPROVAL		DISPATCH		RECOMMENDATION	
COMMENT		FILE		RETURN	
CONCURRENCE		INFORMATION		SIGNATURE	
<p>Remarks: Attached is an excerpt from the Congressional Record of 22 April containing remarks by Senator Clark on the subject of Russian forces in Cuba and containing specific references to the Director, the Agency and intelligence information.</p> <div style="border: 1px solid black; height: 40px; width: 100%;"></div> <p style="text-align: center;">John S. Warner Legislative Counsel</p>					
FOLD HERE TO RETURN TO SENDER					
FROM: NAME, ADDRESS AND PHONE NO.				DATE	
Legislative Counsel, 7D01				23 Apr 63	
UNCLASSIFIED		CONFID		SECRET	

STAT

STAT